



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,525	10/24/2003	Paul Tangen	034430-033	9844
49682	7590	03/20/2006	EXAMINER	
THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP HYPERION P.O. BOX 640640 SAN JOSE, CA 95164-0640			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,525

Applicant(s)

TANGEN ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This is a Non Final rejection in response to letter filed on 3/1/06.
- 2) Effective filing date 10/24/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3-1) **Claims 1-17, 23-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al (US 2003/0037038, filed March 4, 2002), in view of Malloy et al (US 2004/0122844, filed Dec 2002).**

Regarding Claims 1 and 23, Block teaches receiving ... selection. For example, In a method for adding metadata to data, adding labels identifying data in a file, selecting labels that correspond to text strings in the identified data, based on labels (para 15).

Block teaches creating ... a mapping ... metadata. For example, associations made by the user with for labels with text strings (para 15, 16).

Block does not teach, but Malloy suggests organizing ... headings. For example, a row in the fact table and two value columns, where the heading would have been obvious (ie., headings are inherent in spreadsheets, rows numbers on the left side and columns heading on the top as letters)(paragraph 180). Block does not teach, but Malloy suggests receiving from a user ... to be mapped. For example, the designer selects a subset of the possible elements for defining a single relational result set (para 140).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include column and row (with headings) where the user selects possible elements for defining results sets as taught by Malloy, providing the benefit of an improved relational OLAP system (Malloy, para 20).

Regarding claims 2 and 24, Block teaches retrieving from a database. For example, mapped to a database (col 2, lines 1-3).

Regarding claims 3 and 25, Block suggests determining if the external ... predefined; and wherein ... said receiving ... comprises: presenting ... predefined metadata; and receiving ... list. For example, in the method for adding metadata to data, a data element can be imported directly to a specific location within the database, using an independent software application, based on a label associated with both the location and the elements (para 18).

Regarding claim 4 and 26, Block does not expressly teach, but Malloy suggests tree control. For example, reference tree (para 159).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a reference tree as taught by Malloy, providing the benefit of an improved relational OLAP system (Malloy, para 20).

Regarding claim 5 and 27, Block suggests determining if the external ... predefined; and wherein ... said receiving ... comprises: presenting ... predefined metadata; and receiving ... list. For example, in the method for adding metadata to data, a data element can be imported directly to a specific location within the database, using an

independent software application, based on a label associated with both the location and the elements (para 18).

Regarding claim 6 and 28, Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12).

Regarding claim 7 and 29, Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12).

Regarding claim 8 and 30, Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

Block does not expressly teach time, but Malloy does teach time period. For example, time as a data attribute of the data values of the system (para 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12) and further to include time period as taught by Malloy, providing the benefit of an improved relational OLAP system (Malloy, para 20).

Regarding claim 9 and 31, Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12).

Regarding claim 10 and 32, Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12).

Regarding claim 11 and 33, Block teaches selecting. For example, selecting labels (para 15). Block does not expressly teach rows, but Malloy does teach rows. For

example, selecting a subset of possible elements with rows of data (para 140, para 180).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include rows as taught by Malloy, providing the benefit of an improved relational OLAP system (Malloy, para 20).

Regarding claim 12 and 34, Block teaches selecting. For example, selecting labels (para 15). Block does not expressly teach columns, but Malloy does teach columns. For example, selecting a subset of possible elements with rows of data (para 140, para 180).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include rows as taught by Malloy, providing the benefit of an improved relational OLAP system (Malloy, para 20).

Regarding claim 13 and 35, Block teaches selecting individual cells in said grid. For example, in a spreadsheet, selecting labels (para 14, 15).

Regarding claim 14 and 36, Block suggests preexisting mappings ... individual cells. For example, in a spreadsheet program, any data can be overwritten in individual cells (para 14, 15).

Regarding claim 15 and 37, Block teaches receiving ... grid; creating ... grid; entering ... column; and wherein cell. For example, identified data are mapped to a spreadsheet and based on a broad reasonable interpretation of the claims, the limitations are implementable on any spreadsheet program (para 14).

Regarding claim 16 and 38, Block teaches XBRL (para 14).

Regarding claim 17 and 39, Block teaches schema manager. For example, identified data are mapped to a schema (para 14).

3-2) Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Block et al (as cited above).

Regarding claim 18, Block teaches an internal organizer. For example, spreadsheet (para 14). Block teaches a grid ... grid organizer. For example, user can add labels associated with text strings (para 14, 15). Block teaches an external metadata ... receiver. For example, independent software application based on a label associated with location and element (para 18). Block teaches an internal ... receiver. For example, user creating labels to data based on a list associating labels (para 15, 16). Block does not expressly teach internal and external metadata, but Block does teach attaching labels to data to text strings (para 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include metadata as suggested by Block's teaching of labels attached to text, providing the benefit of an automated entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (para 13).

Regarding Claim 19, Block suggests an internal metadata ... grid organizer. For example, mapping to a spreadsheet (para 14).

Regarding Claim 20, Block suggest a predefined external ... definition receiver; and where said external metadata ... includes: a predefined ... presenter; and a predefined ... list presenter. For example, on a spreadsheet and/or database, adding labels to data

including identifying data in the file, selecting labels based on list associating labels with text strings (para 14, 15).

Regarding Claim 21, Block suggests a predefined external ... definition receiver; and wherein said external metadata ... includes: an external ... presenter; an external dialog box presenter. For example, on a spreadsheet and/or database, adding labels to data including identifying data in the file, selecting labels based on list associating labels with text strings (para 14, 15).

Block does not expressly teach a dialog box, but does suggest it since Block does teach a Windows Graphic Interface Device (para 63; Fig 7, item 704).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Block to include a Graphic Interface Device in a Windows environment as taught by Block, providing the benefit of automating entry of XML and XBRL compliant data into non-XML or non-XBRL compliant programs or applications (Block, para 12).

Regarding Claim 22, Block suggests a user formula receiver. For example, a spreadsheet receives formulas (para 14). Block suggests a new row or column ... grid organizer. For example, a spreadsheet creates new rows/columns in association with formulas (para 14, 15). Block suggests a new row or column ... user formula receiver. For example, a spreadsheet allows for placement of formulas to integrate with cells (para 14, 15).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S.

GS


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100